

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated June 10, 2009, has been received and reviewed. This response, submitted along with a Petition for a Three-Month Extension of Time, is directed to that action.

Claim 1 has been amended and claims 17 and 18 have been cancelled. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in paragraphs [0010], [0020], [0076] and [0095] to [0099] of the published US application, 2006/0057366 A1. No new matter has been added.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement because the term “the pressure sensitive adhesive has a glass transition temperature of...” is not supported in the specification. However, the term “the *polymer* has a glass transition temperature of...” is fully supported. The applicants have amended claim 1 accordingly, thus rendering this rejection moot.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1 and 3-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite. The Examiner noted that the claim is ambiguous because it is not clear as to whether the  $T_{gA}$  is of a polymer or the entire PSA. The applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claim 1 renders this rejection moot. However, the Examiner also stated that if the  $T_{gA}$  is of the polymer, “then it appears that not all monomers (claimed by formula (a)) in combination with isobornyl acrylate will yield a  $T_g$  of greater than or equal to 30°C.” (Office Action, page 5, paragraph 14). The applicants agree that not it may be the case that not all monomer combinations will achieve a  $T_g$  according to the present claims. Even

so, this would not render the claim indefinite because a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand the metes and bounds of the invention, i.e., that a polymer combination must have the glass transition temperature within the claimed range. A monomer combination that does not exhibit a glass transition temperature within the claimed range would be outside the scope of the invention, regardless of whether the combination is encompassed by formula (a) and the isobornyl acetate.

Finally, the Examiner noted that the recitation of bond strength in claim 1 does not set forth the specific substrate from which it is measured. Claim 1 has been amended herein, thus obviating this rejection.

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 17 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Maruoka et al. (US 5,252,395) in view of Spada et al. (US 6,293,037) and McLaughlin et al. (US 6,365,793). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The presently claimed invention now requires that the thermal crosslinker is aluminum (III) acetylacetonate. The applicants submit that this limitations renders the claims nonobvious in view of the prior art because, at the time of the present invention, there was no reasonable expectation that this particular thermal crosslinker would be effective in the claimed PSA composition.

The PSA of the presently claimed invention is apolar (as opposed to polar) due to the amount of isobornyl acrylate in the composition. The skilled artisan is well aware that the polarity of a thermal crosslinker should match the polarity of the composition to which it is being added simply because similar chemicals are more easily miscible with each other if the polarity is the same. Indeed, a homogenously crosslinked adhesive requires good miscibility.

To this end, a skilled artisan would not have expected a polar thermal crosslinker to achieve sufficient miscibility in an apolar composition.

Surprisingly, however, a very polar thermal crosslinker, aluminum (III) acetylacetonate, achieved excellent miscibility in the apolar polymer composition of the present invention. Moreover, the polarity of the resulting adhesive did not increase to a level that would have caused unsatisfactory adhesion, which would defeat the entire purpose of a removable adhesive.

Although McLaughlin does teach aluminum acetylacetonate as a thermal crosslinker, his underlying polymer composition is completely different from the polymer of the present invention. Therefore, even though McLaughlin teaches the same crosslinker, a skilled artisan would still not have any reasonable expectation that this crosslinker would work in a completely different polymer composition. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner also rejected claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Maruoka in view of Spada and McLaughlin, and further in view of Massow et al. (US 5,194,455); claims 5 and 13-15 as obvious over Maruoka in view of Spada and McLaughlin and further in view of Khieu (WO 98/24978); and claim 10 as obvious in view of Maruoka in view of Spada and McLaughlin and further in view of Everaerts et al. (US 5,612,136). The applicants respectfully submit that neither of Massow, Khieu or Everaerts remedy the deficiencies described hereinabove with respect to the prior art. The applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance, and such favorable action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain, the resolution of which may

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
DEC 10 2009

be advanced through a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at the phone number listed below.

**CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

If any extension of time for this response is required, Applicants request that this be considered a petition therefore. Please charge the required fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

**ADDITIONAL FEES**

Please charge any further insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess to Deposit Account No. 14-1263

Respectfully submitted,  
NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By /Mark D. Marin/

Mark D. Marin – Reg. No. 50,842  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
875 Third Avenue - 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10022  
Phone: (212) 808-0700  
Fax: (212) 808-0844